

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to continue up to 10 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### A DEFICIT DILEMMA

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post, there was a very interesting op-ed piece that I cannot refrain from commenting on. It is written by Terry Deibel, and it is entitled, "A Liberal Deficit Hawk's Dilemma."

Mr. Deibel describes himself as a liberal who believes in Government, believes that the Federal Government can and does do wonderful things, but that the Government should not "spend more money to do these things than it collects."

He then offers us this fascinating solution to our present dilemma from his position as a self-styled liberal deficit hawk. And I am quoting, Mr. President.

To be sure, a good deal of budget balancing could be done in a policy-neutral fashion. A simple freeze on outlays at current levels or a small across-the-board cut in everything—all spending, all entitlements, including Social Security—prolonged over several years of economic and revenue growth eventually would do the trick without any allocation decisions.

I was stunned when I read this. Here is a man who is a liberal, describes himself as a liberal deficit hawk who is proposing a program far more draconian than anything the Republicans have ever contemplated, a freeze, Mr. President, in all spending across the board, or even a small across-the-board cut in everything—entitlements, including Social Security.

No Republican has dared offer anything that drastic or that draconian. What this says to me, Mr. President, is that Mr. Deibel has fallen victim to the rhetoric of this Chamber and, if you will, of the White House. He has come to believe, as do many of my constituents, that the Republicans are calling for drastic cuts in everything, and he says let us solve the problem with a simple freeze.

Let me give you a few numbers, Mr. President. Total Medicare spending in 1995 was \$178 billion. If this proposal were put in place, that means years from now Medicare spending would be frozen at \$178 billion in contrast to the draconian Republican call for spending of \$301 billion in the year 2002. He is calling for a commonsense, neutral position that would freeze the budget at \$178 billion but, no, those stingy Republicans want to increase it from 178 to 301—a 69 percent increase.

I say to you, Mr. President, he, like too many people, has fallen victim to the rhetoric of this debate without looking at the facts.

On Medicaid—another area where we are being told the Republicans are calling for heartless slashes—this man, a

liberal, says, no, let us take care of Medicaid by simply freezing it at its present level. Its present level is \$83 billion. Under the Republican proposal, by the year 2002, it will reach \$143 billion, a 58-percent increase. But we are being pilloried for being heartless when common sense tells this man we can solve the problem if we just freeze it.

Again, he is a victim of the rhetoric. He does not realize, as, unfortunately, too many people do not realize, the Republicans are not saying let us slash these programs. The Republicans are saying the programs are legitimate, the programs need to grow, as the needs of our people need to grow, but let us let them grow at some kind of intelligent rate. But with the rhetoric, even a man of his knowledge and understanding—and he is identified in the Washington Post as chairman of the Department of National Security Policy at the National War College—even a man of his position and understanding has fallen victim to this rhetoric. I hope he will understand now that the freeze he is calling for as the logical solution is so much more draconian than what the Republicans have suggested that if we were to in fact embrace his proposal, we would be crucified—I think justly—by both the press and, of course, the members of the opposite party.

Now, I cannot conclude without referring to one specific that he talks about which is a further demonstration of the way the rhetoric has distorted the reality. He says:

It is quite possible, after all, to cut corporate welfare or end the great-western-lands-grazing-and-mining free-lunch program, for example, rather than cut poor people's welfare and the school lunch program.

Once again, if you listen to the rhetoric on this floor, you would think that the reason the budget is out of balance is because of the tremendous spending in the West on grazing and the reason we are heartless is because of our cuts in school lunches.

I participated in the filibuster that was mounted on this floor to prevent the Secretary of the Interior from implementing his increase in grazing fees, which we were told would be the way to make everything fair.

The total amount of money that would have come to the Federal Government if the Secretary of Interior had been successful in his effort to increase those grazing fees is \$19 million per year. That is million, "m" as in "minuscule," Mr. President, \$19 million. That is less than we spent to put the new subway between the Capitol and the Senate office buildings.

By comparison, his implication is you could pay for school lunches if only you did away with the grazing program in the Midwest. In 1995 we will spend \$7.9 billion on child nutrition, "b" as in "big." And in 7 years, under the draconian Republican budget, spending on child nutrition will increase to \$9.2 billion a year, a 16.4-percent increase.

I challenge anybody to try to pay for the present program, let alone the increased program, by doing something about a grazing plan in the United States that is currently, by the Secretary of the Interior's own analysis, costing the taxpayers \$19 million.

Before I leave that, however, because \$19 million is, after all, \$19 million, I would refer you to the study that demonstrated that had the Secretary's proposal gone through, instead of receiving \$19 million in additional revenue, in fact it would have driven enough marginal operators off the range that the actual income to the Federal Government would probably not only have been less than \$19 million, but in fact might have endangered the money that they were receiving from the present grazing fees. The revenues could have gone down rather than up.

I will not pursue this any further, Mr. President. I think this is an example of what is wrong with our political dialog. The Republicans are proposing increases, in many cases very substantial increases, in some of our most fundamental programs, and yet the rhetoric around it has been so extreme that even a man of Mr. Deibel's position and understanding thinks he can improve on the Republican's proposals by freezing everything at the present level.

If there was ever a demonstration of the excess and inaccuracy of the rhetoric of this debate, it is Mr. Deibel's op-ed piece in this morning's Washington Post.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELMS). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Thank you, Mr. President.

#### THE BUDGET AND OUR COUNTRY'S FINANCIAL MARKETS

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, this past Friday I made some pretty strong comments with respect to President Clinton's—maybe it was Mr. Panetta's—proposal which we saw. There was great anticipation, if the President will recall, that last Friday there was going to be a new, serious proposal to balance the budget that President Clinton was going to bring to the table.

I felt, and I think expressed in pretty strong language, that it was a phony attempt. In fact, I thought it was an insult to the Congress, frankly, that the President would come forward with that proposal.

But something significant has happened since Friday. We may in fact have a new player in this budget debate. We may in fact have a new player to the debate which over the last 30 days or so has been between the White House, the President, on one hand and the Congress on the other. The third party who I think has now come to the debate is the financial markets of our country.

For those who have not been observing what has occurred today in the